

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to line 2 of Claim 1, indicating that the alkali metal builder is believed to be a transcription error. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Support for alkali metal builders is found on page 5 of the instant application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1 - 4, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,308,513 issued to Harmalker et al.. The Examiner indicates that Harmalker et al. teaches fabric conditioning aqueous liquid emulsions which are wash cycle additives for through-the-wash use. To support this assertion the Examiner indicates that Harmalker et al. teaches a composition of a liquid emulsion containing hydroxyethylcellulose polymers and a nonionic surfactant which is added to a granular detergent containing surfactants and pentasodium tripolyphosphate, sodium pyrophosphate, and sodium carbonate as builders. The Examiner cites Examples 2 and 4 of Harmalker et al. to support the rejection.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." M.P.E.P. § 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131 citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Harmalker et al. does not teach the combination of a granular detergent with a liquid emulsion containing hydroxyethylcellulose polymers and a nonionic surfactant. The Examiner is respectfully referred to Example 4 on page 11, lines 35 - 40. Rather, Example 4 of Hamalker et al. teaches the combination of the disclosed granular detergent with the composition of Example 1 of Harmalker et al. [see page 9, lines 15 - 68 of Harmalker et al.].

Hence, Harmalker et al. does not anticipate the instant application. As the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) have been overcome, Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection and allow the claims in the instant application.

SUMMARY

This a request for continued examination of the instant application. Any fees associated with this request should be charged to deposit account number 16-2480. Claim 1 has been amended. The Examiner's objection and rejection of the instant application under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection and allow the claims in the instant application. No new matter is added.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: Jiping Wang et al.

BY: 
Julia A. Glazer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

October 16, 2002
Customer No. 27752